

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 21-26 remain pending in the instant application. Claims 1-12 and 21-26 presently stand rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 21 are amended herein. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12 and 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Narayana et al. (US 6,577,635).

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found in a single reference. M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131 (citing *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

Amended independent claim 1 now recites, in pertinent part,

wherein the labeling is performed by a first subsystem and the mapping, scheduling, and encapsulating are performed by a second subsystem, the first and second subsystems interconnected via a switch coupled to a switch fabric, **wherein the first and second subsystems are disposed either on a baseboard or on the baseboard and one or more mezzanine cards coupled to the baseboard.**

Applicants respectfully submit that Narayana fails to disclose a first subsystem for performing labeling interconnected via a switch coupled to a switch fabric with a second subsystem for performing mapping, scheduling and encapsulating wherein the these subsystems are disposed either on a single baseboard or a baseboard and one or more mezzanine cards coupled to the baseboard.

To be sure, FIG. 3 of Narayana “illustrates a block schematic diagram of a switch or router 300 that may be utilized as any of the switches 124, 126 and 128 or edge equipment 102-110 of FIG. 1.” *Narayana*, col. 6, lines 4-6. However, FIG. 3 fails to disclose a subsystem for labeling network packets being coupled to a subsystem for mapping, scheduling, and encapsulating packets through a switch that is coupled to a switch fabric. In fact, the Office Action cites text associated with FIG. 2 of Narayana (col. 4, line 57 to col. 5, line 9) as disclosing the labeling element of claim 1. However,

this portion of Narayana merely discloses label switching in an MPLS standard network. It does not disclose the labeling operation being performed by a first subsystem that is coupled to a second subsystem for performing mapping, scheduling, and encapsulation through a switch that is also coupled to a switch fabric. FIG. 3 of Narayana illustrates queuing engines 316 and schedulers 320, but fails to illustrate any of these elements coupled to a subsystem for labeling packets via a switch coupled to a switch fabric.

In contrast, by way of example and not limitation, FIG. 2 of the instant application illustrates a subsystem 108 for labeling network packets (see, e.g., specification, page 8, lines 21-23) coupled to a subsystem 110 for mapping, scheduling, and encapsulating the network packets through a switch 104 that is coupled to a switch fabric 102.

In the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action mailed 11/27/07, the Examiner reaffirmed his previous rejection stating, “different subsystems in **different switches** are interconnected together.” Accordingly, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the first and second subsystems disposed either on a baseboard or on a baseboard and one or more mezzanine cards coupled to the baseboard. Narayana fails to disclose this element of claim 1. In fact, the Office Action’s interpretation of Narayana is opposite to these elements being on the same baseboard or baseboard and one or more mezzanine cards coupled to the baseboard, since it attempts to satisfy the claim elements by combining elements allegedly present in the different switches of FIG. 1.

Similarly, independent claim 9 has been amended to recite,

wherein the classification element is coupled to the mapping element, the scheduler, and the encapsulation element via a switch for coupling to a switch fabric,

wherein the classification element, the mapping element, the scheduler, and the encapsulation element are disposed **within a single network node**.

For the reasons discussed above, Narayana fails to disclose a classification element coupled to a mapping element, a scheduler, and an encapsulation element via a switch, all within a single network node. Rather, the Office Action refers to different network nodes or switches.

Consequently, Narayana fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1 and 9, as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Independent claim 21 now includes similar novel elements as independent claim 9. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant §102 rejections of claims 1, 9, and 21 is requested.

The dependent claims are novel over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 102 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayana et al.

“To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03.

The dependent claims are nonobvious over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with their respective independent claims, in addition to adding further limitations of their own. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the instant § 103 rejections of the dependent claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (206) 292-8600 if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

CHARGE DEPOSIT ACCOUNT

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Please credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Jan. 25, 2008

/Cory G. Claassen/

Cory G. Claassen
Reg. No. 50,296
Phone: (206) 292-8600

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040